

lo:					PCI	16.9.30
						Lang.
	see form F	PCT/ISA/220	•		TTEN OPINION (NAL SEARCHIN	
					(PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i>	
				Date of mailing		
				(day/month/year) s	ee form PCT/ISA/210 (se	cond sheet)
	icant's or agent's file			FOR FURTHER		
	form PCT/ISA/22			See paragraph 2 be		
	national application N		International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (dayimo 27.05.2003	nth/year)
<u> </u>	Г/JP2004/007441	<u> </u>	25.05.2004	V	27.05.2003	<u> </u>
		sification (IPC) or	both national classificatio	n and IPC		
105	5K13/08					
• •	icant				,	
1A	TSUSHITA ELEC	CTRIC INDUS	TRIAL CO., LTD.	V	•	
	This opinion co	ntains indicati	ons relating to the fo	llowing items:		
•	This opinion co		_	llowing items:		
•	_	ntains indicati Basis of the op Priority	_	llowing items:		
•	⊠ Box No. I	Basis of the op	_		itive step and industria	l applicability
•	☐ Box No. I☐ Box No. II	Basis of the op	pinion V whent of opinion with re		itive step and industria	l applicability
	Box No. IBox No. IIBox No. III	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state	pinion V whent of opinion with re	gard to novelty, inven	to novelty, inventive st	
•	☑ Box No. I☑ Box No. II☐ Box No. III☐ Box No. IV	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state	pinion ment of opinion with rest invention tement under Rule 43th itations and explanation	gard to novelty, inven	to novelty, inventive st	
•	 Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V 	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum	pinion ment of opinion with rest invention tement under Rule 43th itations and explanation	gard to novelty, inven ois.1(a)(i) with regard ns supporting such st	to novelty, inventive st	
	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VI Box No. VII	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned stat applicability; c Certain docum Certain defect	ment of opinion with re of invention tement under Rule 43£ itations and explanation	gard to novelty, inventions. 1(a)(i) with regard the supporting such states the supporting such states the supportions.	to novelty, inventive st	
	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VI Box No. VII	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; c Certain docum Certain defect Certain observe	ment of opinion with re of invention tement under Rule 43t itations and explanation nents cited s in the international a	gard to novelty, inventions. 1(a)(i) with regard the supporting such states the supporting such states the supportions.	to novelty, inventive st	
	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII Box No. VIII	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observation	ment of opinion with re of invention tement under Rule 43th itations and explanation nents cited is in the international a vations on the international	gard to novelty, inventions. 1(a)(i) with regard ns supporting such straightful pplication onal application	to novelty, inventive st tatement	ep or industrial
	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI If a demand for i written opinion o the applicant che	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observations ION	ment of opinion with re of invention tement under Rule 43t itations and explanation nents cited s in the international a	gard to novelty, inventions 1(a)(i) with regard ns supporting such simplication onal application s made, this opinion ving Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and ti	to novelty, inventive st tatement / will usually be consider to However, this does not chosen tPEA has no	ep or industrial red to be a not apply where otifed the
	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI If a demand for i written opinion o the applicant che international Bur will not be so coll f this opinion is, submit to the IPI	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned stat applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observations ION International press of the Internation press an Author reau under Rule insidered. as provided ab EA a written reper date of mailing	ment of opinion with re of invention tement under Rule 43t itations and explanation nents cited is in the international a vations on the international al Preliminary Examination is	gard to novelty, inventions 1(a)(i) with regard in supporting such strong polication onal application in supporting Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this Internal written opinion of the propriate, with amenda	vill usually be consider to the chosen IPEA has no national Searching Authents, before the expirents, before the expirents.	ep or industrial red to be a not apply where otified the thority is invited to ration of three
2.	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI If a demand for i written opinion of the applicant che international Burn will not be so could fithis opinion is, submit to the IPI months from the policy in the internation is the internation is submit to the IPI months from the internation is the internation is the internation is submit to the IPI months from the internation is the internation in the i	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observations ION International pressure of the Internation reau under Rulensidered. as provided ab EA a written reperted as provided ab each a defendable of mailing estater.	ment of opinion with report invention tement under Rule 43th itations and explanation ments cited as in the international advations on the international eliminary examination is all Preliminary Examination that Preliminary Examination that Preliminary Examination is 66.1 bis(b) that writter every considered to be only together, where apply of Form PCT/ISA/220	gard to novelty, inventions 1(a)(i) with regard in supporting such strong polication onal application in supporting Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this Internal written opinion of the propriate, with amenda	vill usually be consider to the chosen IPEA has no national Searching Authents, before the expirents, before the expirents.	ep or industrial red to be a not apply where otified the thority is invited to ration of three
	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI If a demand for i written opinion of the applicant che International Bur will not be so coll fithis opinion is, submit to the IPI months from the whichever expired.	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observations ION International present of the Internation reau under Rulensidered. as provided ab EA a written reperted as written reperted as later. Ins., see Form Priority	ment of opinion with report invention tement under Rule 43th itations and explanation ments cited as in the international advations on the international eliminary examination is all Preliminary Examination that Preliminary Examination that Preliminary Examination is 66.1 bis(b) that writter every considered to be only together, where apply of Form PCT/ISA/220	gard to novelty, inventions 1(a)(i) with regard in supporting such strong polication onal application in supporting Authority ("IPEA") to be the IPEA and the opinions of this Internal written opinion of the propriate, with amenda	vill usually be consider to the chosen IPEA has no national Searching Authents, before the expirents, before the expirents.	ep or industrial red to be a not apply where otified the thority is invited to ration of three

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Bolder, G

Authorized Officer

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3636



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/JP2004/007441

_		
_	Box	No. I Basis of the opinion
1.	With the I	regard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in anguage in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following anguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With nece	regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and ssary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. ty	e of material:
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. for	mat of material:
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	c. tim	e of filing/furnishing:
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.	C	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as oppropriate, were furnished.
ŧ.	Additi	onal comments:

	Box No. II	Priority					
1. 🛭	☑ The fo	llowing document ha	as not beer	n furnished	j :		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	⊠	copy of the earlier	application	n whose pr	iority has	been claimed (R	ule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(a)).
		translation of the e	arlier appli	cation who	ose priorit	y has been claim	ed (Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 66.7(b)).
							ity claim. This opinion has s the claimed priority date.
2 . [has be		ules 43 <i>bis</i> .	1 and 64.1). Thus fo	r the purposes o	to the fact that the priority clain f this opinion, the international
3. /	Additional of	observations, if nece	essary:				
							•
	Box No. V	Reasoned state applicability; citati	ment und	er Rule 43 explanatio	B <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard to	novelty, inventive step or perment
i		Reasoned state applicability; citati	ment und ons and e	er Rule 43 explanatio	B <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i ns suppo) with regard to rting such state	novelty, inventive step or ement
1. S	industrial	applicability; citati	ons and e	er Rule 43 explanatio Claims Claims	3 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i ns suppo 1-12) with regard to rting such state	novelty, inventive step or ement
1. S	industrial Statement	applicability; citati	Yes: No:	explanatio Claims	ns suppo	rting such state	novelty, inventive step or ement

see separate sheet

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)



PCT/JP2004/007441

Re Item V.

- The following document is referred to in this communication:
 D1: WO 02/13590 A (MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC IND CO LTD) 14 February 2002 (2002-02-14)
- 2 Independent claim 1
- 2.1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document): "A component mounting sequence optimizing method in component mounting (page 2, line 23 page 3, line 4) with use of a component holding head having a plurality of component holding members (page 99, lines 9 24; figure 44)" From this, the subject-matter of independent claim 1 differs in that: "the holding head also comprises a component image pickup section" The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT).
- 2.2 The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as: "how to optimize the mounting of components using the component image pickup section provided on the head".
- 2.3 The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:
 "the method comprises comparing conveyance times with recognition times and
 - the method comprises comparing conveyance times with recognition times and determining a mounting sequence on basis of the result of the comparison. This is possible only after realizing that recognition and conveyance are independent steps, that do not need to be performed one after the other if there is an image pickup section on the conveyance head. In the prior art there is no indication of this solution".
- 2.4 Claims 2, 3 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

International application No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/JP2004/007441

3 Independent claims 4, 7 and 10

Although claims 4,7 and 10 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter as independent claim 1. It would therefore appear appropriate to amend these claims as dependent on claim 1.

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)